

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/708,658	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HERDMAN, RODRICK A.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Lloyd A. Gall	<b>Art Unit</b> 3676	

**All Participants:**

(1) Lloyd A. Gall.

(2) Daniel F. Nesbitt.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 1 February 2007
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

6

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**
*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Gall questioned the double bracket location in claim 6, line 10, and Mr. Nesbitt confirmed that the double bracket was intended to be located after "position" in claim 6, line 9. It was agreed that the claim should be examined with the line 9 location in mind, and that Mr. Nesbitt would correct the location in the next response. .